



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,397	05/31/2001	Eugene B. Hogenauer	2096P	2872
7590 11/05/2004			EXAMINER	
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr. SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP P.O. Box 51418 Palo Alto, CA 94303			ALI, SYED J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2127	

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/872,397	HOGENAUER, EUGENE B.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Syed J Ali	2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) <input type="checkbox"/> | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing-Review (PTO-948)                 | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)              | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

#### ***Specification***

2. The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be updated, i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 3, line 12. The entire specification should be so revised.

#### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to because the drawings are handwritten and illegible. Additionally, the handwriting is very faint and difficult to read. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any

Art Unit: 2127

required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Objections***

**4. Claims 6, 10, 12, and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:**

- a. In line 1 of claim 6, "-" should be deleted.
- b. In line 1 of claim 10, "-" should be deleted.
- c. There is no period at the end of claim 12.
- d. In line 1 of claim 20, "scheduled" should read "schedule".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

**5.** The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**6. Claims 1-3, 12, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wuytack et al. (USPN 6,421,809) (hereinafter Wuytack).**

Art Unit: 2127

7. As per claim 1, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for scheduling an assembled program in an adaptable computing engine, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of computation units as hardware resources available to perform a particular segment of the assembled program (col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 12);

representing the particular segment as a dataflow graph (col. 7 lines 26-35); and

refining a schedule that allocates the plurality of computation units in correspondence with the dataflow graph in an iterative manner until a feasible schedule is achieved (col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8).

8. As per claim 2, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1 wherein the step of refining further comprises associating a value representing cost of the schedule, and determining if the value meets conditions of acceptability (col. 7 lines 36-51).

9. As per claim 3, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 2 wherein the conditions of acceptability further comprise a cost of zero (col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8).

10. As per claim 12, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for scheduling an assembled program in an adaptable computing engine, the system comprising:

a plurality of computation units for providing hardware resources available to perform a particular segment of the assembled program (col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 12);

Art Unit: 2127

a host controller for configuring the plurality of computation units (col. 7 line 52 - col. 8 line 2); and

means for scheduling and allocating the plurality of computation units to perform the particular segment by refining a schedule that allocates the plurality of computation units in correspondence with a dataflow graph representative of the particular segment in an iterative manner until a feasible schedule is achieved (col. 7 lines 26-35; col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8).

11. As per claim 14, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 12 wherein the means for scheduling and allocating further associates a value representing cost of the schedule, and determines if the value meets conditions of acceptability (col. 7 lines 36-51).

12. As per claim 15, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein the conditions of acceptability further comprise a cost of zero (col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 4-10 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wuytack in view of Crawford, Jr. et al. (USPN 6,456,996) (hereinafter Crawford).**

15. As per claim 4, Crawford teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 2 wherein when the value does not meet conditions of acceptability, the method further comprises altering the schedule through a small incremental change in a random manner to provide an altered schedule (col. 7 lines 30-41).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wuytack and Crawford since Wuytack considers every possible move before deciding which is best suited for effecting the greatest overall improvement upon the schedule. This may lead to a great deal of overhead in processing the cost for each possible move, resulting in an even greater delay. Crawford improves upon this by identifying the most likely causes for delay in the schedule. Once these have been identified, nodes are selected at random and the most promising modification is used. This reduces the number of calculations required without sacrificing the possible improvement to the schedule.

17. As per claim 5, Crawford teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 4 wherein the altering in a random manner further comprises selecting a node of the dataflow graph at random and selecting an available change for the selected node at random (col. 7 lines 30-41).

Art Unit: 2127

18. As per claim 6, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 4 further comprising computing the value for the altered schedule (col. 18 lines 33-61).

19. As per claim 7, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 6 wherein when the altered schedule has a computed value that is higher than the value of the schedule, the altered schedule is not used (col. 18 lines 33-61).

20. As per claim 8, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 6 wherein when the altered schedule has a computed value that is lower than the value of the schedule, the method further comprises designating the altered schedule as the schedule, and repeating the step of determining if the value meets conditions of acceptability (col. 18 lines 33-61).

21. As per claim 9, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 8 wherein when the value does meet conditions of acceptability, the method further comprises designating the schedule as the feasible schedule (col. 18 lines 33-61).

22. As per claim 10, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 9 further comprising representing the particular segment as a scheduled dataflow graph once the feasible schedule has been achieved (col. 19 lines 6-7).



Art Unit: 2127

23. As per claim 16, Crawford teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 14 wherein when the value does not meet conditions of acceptability, the means for scheduling and allocating further alters the schedule through a small incremental change in a random manner to provide an altered schedule (col. 7 lines 30-41).

24. As per claim 17, Crawford teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 16 wherein the means for scheduling and altering further alters in a random manner by selecting a node of the dataflow graph at random and selecting an available change for the selected node at random (col. 7 lines 30-41).

25. As per claim 18, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 16 wherein the means for scheduling and altering further computes the value for the altered schedule (col. 18 lines 33-61).

26. As per claim 19, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 18 wherein when the altered schedule has a computed value that is higher than the value of the schedule, the altered schedule is not used (col. 18 lines 33-61).

Art Unit: 2127

27. As per claim 20, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 18 wherein when the altered schedule has a computed value that is lower than the value of the schedule, the means for scheduling and altering further designates the altered schedule as the schedule and repeats the determination of whether the value meets conditions of acceptability (col. 18 lines 33-61).

28. As per claim 21, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 20 wherein when the value does meet conditions of acceptability, the means for scheduling and altering further designates the schedule as the feasible schedule (col. 18 lines 33-61).

29. As per claim 22, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 21 wherein the means for scheduling and altering further represents the particular segment as a scheduled dataflow graph once the feasible schedule has been achieved (col. 19 lines 6-7).

30. **Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wuytack in view of Subramanian et al. (US 2002/0024993) (hereinafter Subramanian).**

31. As per claim 11, Subramanian teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1 wherein providing a plurality of computation units further comprises providing the plurality of computation units as a matrix in the adaptable computing machine (paragraph 0050).

Art Unit: 2127

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wuytack and Subramanian since the representing of computation units in a matrix allows for simple calculations. Standard algorithms for calculating values based on matrix algebra are well known and are easily adaptable to interchanging components. A matrix representation provides a great improvement to the calculating capabilities of the system as well as allowing easy reconfiguration.

33. As per claim 13, Subramanian teaches the invention as claimed, including the system of claim 12 wherein the plurality of computation units further comprise a matrix of the adaptable computing engine (paragraph 0050).

34. **Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wuytack in view of Subramanian in view of Crawford.**

35. As per claim 23, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for determining an optimal schedule for a plurality of computation units in an adaptable computing engine, the method comprising:

determining a value representative of a cost for a chosen schedule to perform a code segment (col. 7 lines 36-51);

adjusting the chosen schedule through small incremental steps until the value reaches an acceptable cost level (col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8); and

designating a feasible schedule once the acceptable cost level is reached (col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8).

36. Subramanian teaches the invention as claimed, including providing the plurality of computation units as a matrix in the adaptable computing engine (paragraph 0050).

37. Crawford teaches the invention as claimed, including adjusting the schedule randomly (col. 7 lines 30-41).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wuytack, Subramanian, and Crawford since the representing of computation units in a matrix allows for simple calculations. Standard algorithms for calculating values based on matrix algebra are well known and are easily adaptable to interchanging components. A matrix representation provides a great improvement to the calculating capabilities of the system as well as allowing easy reconfiguration. Additionally, Wuytack considers every possible move before deciding which is best suited for effecting the greatest overall improvement upon the schedule. This may lead to a great deal of overhead in processing the cost for each possible move, resulting in an even greater delay. Crawford improves upon this by identifying the most likely causes for delay in the schedule. Once these have been identified, nodes are selected at random and the most promising modification is used. This reduces the number of calculations required without sacrificing the possible improvement to the schedule.

39. As per claim 24, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 23 wherein the acceptable cost level further comprises a cost of zero (col. 16 line 36 - col. 17 line 8).

40. As per claim 25, Wuytack teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 23 further comprising representing the code segment as a dataflow graph of nodes and edges (col. 7 lines 26-35).

41. As per claim 26, Crawford teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 25 wherein the step of adjusting further comprises selecting a node of the dataflow graph at random and selecting an available change for the node at random to adjust the chosen schedule (col. 7 lines 30-41).

### ***Conclusion***

42. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-3769. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2127

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Syed Ali  
October 22, 2004



**MENG-AL T. AN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**